



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/851,664	05/09/2001	Robert De Leys	11362.0025.DVUS03 INNS:02	4387
Matthew L Madsen HOWREY SIMON ARNOLD & WHITE, LLP 750 Bering Drive Houston, TX 77057-2198			EXAMINER ZEMAN, ROBERT A	
			ART UNIT 1645	PAPER NUMBER

DATE MAILED: 06/10/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/851,664

Applicant(s)

DE LEYS ET AL.

Examiner

Robert A. Zeman

Art Unit

1645

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 January 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 31 and 37-41 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 38-40 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 31, 37 and 41 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☒ Claim(s) 31 and 37-41 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 5-9-2001.
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

The amendment and response filed on 3-8-2004 are acknowledged. Claim 31 has been amended. Claim 41 has been added.

Specification

Applicant has not complied with one or more conditions for receiving the benefit of an earlier filing date under 35 U.S.C. 120 as follows:

An application in which the benefits of an earlier application are desired must contain a specific reference to the prior application(s) in the first sentence of the specification or in an application data sheet (37 CFR 1.78(a)(2) and (a)(5)). The specific reference to any prior nonprovisional application must include the relationship (i.e., continuation, divisional, or continuation-in-part) between the applications except when the reference is to a prior application of a CPA assigned the same application number. Additionally, the current status of each prior application must be indicated.

Election/Restrictions

Applicant's election of Group I in the reply filed on 3-8-2004 is acknowledged. Because applicant did not distinctly and specifically point out the supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election has been treated as an election without traverse (MPEP § 818.03(a)).

The requirement is still deemed proper and is therefore made FINAL.

With regard to Applicant's request that newly added generic claim 41 be examined with the elected claims and that the non-elected claims be rejoined when said generic claim is found

Art Unit: 1645

allowable, Applicant's arguments have been fully considered and deemed persuasive. Therefore, claims 38-40 will be rejoined upon when generic claim 41 is deemed allowable.

Claims 31 and 37-41 are pending. Claims 38-40 are withdrawn from consideration.

Claims 31, 37 and 41 are currently under examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claim 31, 37 and 41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. This is a new matter rejection.

Applicant has amended claim 41 to recite "... wherein the DNA probe **specifically hybridizes** with the genomic RNA of the HIV-3 retrovirus...". This phrase does not appear in the specification, or original claims as filed. Applicant does not point out specific basis for this limitation in the application, and none is apparent. No particular amino acid sequence of any probe that specifically hybridizes to the genomic RNA of the HIV-3 retrovirus deposited at the European Collection of Animal Cell Cultures (ECACC) under No. V88060301 and nothing else. Therefore this limitation is new matter.

35 U.S.C. 112, Written Description Rejection

Applicant is directed to the Guidelines for the Examination of Patent Applications Under the 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph "Written Description" Requirement, Federal Register, Vol. 66, No. 4, pages 1099-1111, Friday January 5, 2001.

Claims 31 and 41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

The specification discloses SEQ ID NO:1 that corresponds to a portion of the HIV-3 cDNA (iso 70-11 clone). SEQ ID NO:1 meets the written description provision of 35 USC 112, first paragraph. However, the aforementioned claims are directed to encompass probes that specifically hybridize to genomic RNA of the HIV-3 retrovirus deposited at the European Collection of Animal Cell Cultures (ECACC) under No. V88060301. None of these sequences meet the written description provision of 35 USC 112, first paragraph. The specification provides insufficient written description to support the genus encompassed by the claim.

Vas-Cath Inc. v. Mahurkar, 19 USPQ2d 1111, makes clear that "applicant must convey with reasonable clarity to those skilled in the art that, as of the filing date sought, he or she was in possession of *the invention*. The invention is, for purposes of the 'written description' inquiry, *whatever is now claimed*." (See page 1117.) The specification does not "clearly allow persons of ordinary skill in the art to recognize that [he or she] invented what is claimed." (See Vas-Cath at page 1116.)

The skilled artisan cannot envision the detailed chemical structure of the encompassed polynucleotides and/or proteins, regardless of the complexity or simplicity of the method of isolation.

Art Unit: 1645

Adequate written description requires more than a mere statement that it is part of the invention and reference to a potential method for isolating it. The nucleic acid itself is required. See Fiers v. Revel, 25 USPQ2d 1601, 1606 (CAFC 1993) and Amgen Inc. V. Chugai Pharmaceutical Co. Ltd., 18 USPQ2d 1016. In Fiddes v. Baird, 30 USPQ2d 1481, 1483, claims directed to mammalian FGF's were found unpatentable due to lack of written description for the broad class. The specification provided only the bovine sequence.

Finally, University of California v. Eli Lilly and Co., 43 USPQ2d 1398, 1404. 1405 held that: ...To fulfill the written description requirement, a patent specification must describe an invention and does so in sufficient detail that one skilled in the art can clearly conclude that "the inventor invented the claimed invention." Lockwood v. American Airlines Inc., 107 F.3d 1565, 1572, 41 USPQ2d 1961, 1966 (1997); In re Gosteli, 872 F.2d 1008, 1012, 10 USPQ2d 1614, 1618 (Fed. Cir. 1989) (" [T]he description must clearly allow persons of ordinary skill in the art to recognize that [the inventor] invented what is claimed."). Thus, an applicant complies with the written description requirement "by describing the invention, with all its claimed limitations, not that which makes it obvious," and by using "such descriptive means as words, structures, figures, diagrams, formulas, etc., that set forth the claimed invention." Lockwood, 107 F.3d at 1572, 41 USPQ2d at 1966.

An adequate written description of a DNA, such as the cDNA of the recombinant plasmids and microorganisms of the '525 patent, "requires a precise definition, such as by structure, formula, chemical name, or physical properties," not a mere wish or plan for obtaining the claimed chemical invention. Fiers v. Revel, 984 F.2d 1164, 1171, 25 USPQ2d 1601, 1606 (Fed. Cir. 1993). Accordingly, "an adequate written description of a DNA requires more than a mere statement that it is part of the invention and reference to a potential method for isolating it; what is required is a description of the DNA itself." *Id.* at 1170, 25 USPQ2d at 1606.

The name cDNA is not itself a written description of that DNA; it conveys no distinguishing information concerning its identity. While the example provides a process for obtaining human insulin-encoding cDNA, there is no further information in the patent pertaining to that cDNA's relevant structural or physical characteristics; in other words, it thus does not describe human insulin cDNA. Describing a method of preparing a cDNA or even describing the protein that the cDNA encodes, as the example does, does not necessarily describe the cDNA itself. No sequence information indicating which nucleotides constitute human cDNA appears in the patent, as appears for rat cDNA in Example 5 of the patent. Accordingly, the specification does not provide a written description of the invention of claim 5.

Moreover, while SEQ ID NO:1 is disclosed, the specification is silent as to whether said sequence will meet the functional limitations of the rejected claims. Therefore, there are no disclosed probe sequences that meet the written description provision of 35 USC 112, first paragraph. Applicant is reminded that Vas-Cath makes clear that the written description provision of 35 USC 112 is severable from its enablement provision. (See page 1115.)

Claims 31, 37 and 41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

Claims 31 and 41 encompass polynucleotides (DNA probes) comprising non-disclosed nucleic acid sequences that **specifically hybridize** to the genomic RNA of the HIV-3 retrovirus deposited at the European Collection of Animal Cell Cultures (ECACC) under No. V88060301 under stringent conditions. Claim 37 is drawn to DNA probes comprising SEQ ID NO:1 or the complement of SEQ ID NO:1. The specification teaches that “stringent conditions” refer to “the conditions under which the actual hybridization and/or the subsequent wash steps are performed” (see page 16, line36 to page 17, line 2). The specification fails to specifically define what parameters constitute “stringent conditions”. Therefore, said term is not limiting. As disclosed above, the specification does not teach how to make any polynucleotides that specifically hybridizes to the genomic RNA of the HIV-3 retrovirus deposited at the European Collection of Animal Cell Cultures (ECACC) under No. V88060301. Clearly, since the specification has not taught how to make/use said polynucleotides, the specification has not enabled the instant claims

Art Unit: 1645

that require DNA probes that specifically hybridize to the genomic RNA of the HIV-3 retrovirus deposited at the European Collection of Animal Cell Cultures (ECACC) under No. V88060301. Said probes include those comprising SEQ ID NO:1 or the complement of thereof. When given the broadest reasonable interpretation, the claims are clearly intended to encompass a variety of species including full-length cDNAs, genes and protein coding regions. Moreover, the use of the term “comprising” (claim 37) and “contains” (claim 31) reads on intact genomic material comprising enhancers, promoters, introns, and splice sites, etc. No open reading frames are identified in any sequence such that one of skill in the art would be able to determine where such features could be within the sequence. Clearly, it would be expected that a substantial number of the hybridizing or complementary polynucleotides encompassed by the claims would not share either structural or functional properties with polynucleotides that encode SEQ ID NO:1 or its complement. The specification fails to provide an enabling disclosure for how one would make such polynucleotides. The specification provides insufficient guidance with regard to these issues and provides no working examples that would provide guidance to one skilled in the art on how to make/use the broadly claimed genus. For the above reasons, undue experimentation would be required to practice the claimed invention.

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 31, 37 and 41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 31 is rendered vague and indefinite by the recitation of the phrase "...at least 360 contiguous sequences corresponding to the genomic RNA of the HIV-3...". It is unclear what is meant by said phrase. Does the term "360" refer to the number of nucleotides or a multiplicity of the HIV-3 genome that must be present in the claimed probe? As written, it is impossible to determine the metes and bounds of the claimed invention.

Claim 41 is rendered vague and indefinite by the use of the phrase "stringent hybridization conditions". It is unclear what parameters are encompassed by said phrase as the specification fails to provide a definition.

Claim 41 is rendered vague and indefinite by the use of the term "specifically hybridizes". It is unclear what is meant by said term. Is the "specificity" referring to the deposited material specifically or HIV-3 generally? As written, it is impossible to determine the metes and bounds of the claimed invention.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 31 and 41 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Montagnier et al. (WO 86/02383 – IDS- 5/9/2001).

Montagnier et al. disclose methods for the use of DNA hybridization probes for the detection of LAV (HIV) in tissues and fluids (see page 38-39). It is deemed, in the absence of evidence to the contrary, that one of the probes encompassed by the Montagnier et al. disclosure will be effective in the detection of HIV-3 or its RNA since the hybridization conditions and the limitation "specifically" have not been defined.

Conclusion


No claim is allowed.

SEQ ID NO:1 is free of the art of record.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Robert A. Zeman whose telephone number is (571) 272-0866. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday- Thursday, 7am -5:30 p.m..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Lynette Smith can be reached on (571) 272-0864. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


LYNETTE R. F. SMITH
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1600